UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,068	08/20/2003	Hisashi Nakamura	031016	4352
	7590 04/07/201 , HATTORI, DANIEL	EXAMINER		
	TICUT AVENUE, NV	XIAO, KE		
WASHINGTON, DC 20036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/07/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentmail@whda.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Applicant(s)		
NAKAMURA ET AL	NAKAMURA ET AL.	
Art Unit		
2629		
	NAKAMURA ET AL Art Unit	

	Ke Xiao	2629	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ess
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 March 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. .ED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original controls.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	out prior to the data of filing a brief	مط لمصموم مطاعم النب	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better the content of th	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or			
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		(.	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ll and/or appellant fails	to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Sumati Lefkowitz/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues that Okamoto must enter two consecutive passwords that are identical in order to lock the keyboard, whereas the present invention must enter a previously registered password with the LCD device in order to lock the keyboard. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The fact that Okamoto teaches that two consecutive identical passwords must be entered in order to lock the keyboard signifies that the first entering of the password must be registered with the display in order to acknowledge that the second password matches. Therefore even through the inventions are slightly different the claimed invention is satisfied through the current rejection. Applicant further argues that Okamoto fails to teach "an external computer" as claimed. The applicant also argues that elements 5 and 22 do not satisify the claimed limitations of an external computer. However the claims do not have a specific deinition for said term, therefore one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention can reasonably interpret elements 5 and 22 to be an external computer to the LCD display device. Finally the applicant argues that the invention of Okamoto would destroy the invention of Mizoguchi since it inhibits the operation of the keyboard. However the entering of the password as disclosed by Okamoto coincides with a registration of the password which occurs at a different state of the password entry means, thus can operate in the same system as Mizoguchi's invention.